



Do not enter
BZ

AF/2875

Attorney Docket SEL 201

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of)
Hajime Kamura)
Serial No.: 09/631,067)
Filed: August 1, 2000)
For: Front Light And Electronic Device)
Art Unit: 2875)
Examiner: B. Zeade)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents ,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

DECEMBER 19, 2003

(Date of Deposit)

ELAUNDA BANKS

Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered Rep.

Elaunda Banks

Signature

12/19/03
Date

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT (D) (AFTER FINAL)

Sir:

In furtherance of Applicant's prior response to the Final Rejection of September 10, 2003,
please amend the above-identified application as follows:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RECEIVED
DEC 31 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800



BEST AVAILABLE COPY

AF 2875

Attorney Docket SEL 201

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of)
)
Hajime Kamura)
)
Serial No.: 09/631,067)
)
Filed: August 1, 2000)
)
For: Front Light And Electronic Device)
)
Art Unit: 2875)
)
Examiner: B. Zeade)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

December 10, 2003

(Date of Deposit)

Shannon Wallace

Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered Rep.

Shannon Wallace 12/10/03
Signature Date

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE (C) (AFTER FINAL)

Sir:

Applicant has the following response to the Final Rejection of September 10, 2000

Applicant appreciates the allowance of Claims 2, 5-7, 9-11, 15 and 18-27. Applicant will now address the Examiner's remaining rejection.

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner is maintaining the rejection of Claims 1, 3-4, 8-9, 12-13, 20 and 23 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Beeson et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, in the Final Rejection, the Examiner contends that Beeson discloses a light guide plate (6/82) and a plurality of prism-shaped lenses (80/28) each being in contact with a lower surface of the light guide (6/82). Applicant disagrees.

Reference numeral 82 in Beeson is a substrate which is to serve as a spacer between the microlenses 80 and the microprisms 28 (see col. 8, lns. 44-46 in Beeson). It is not a light guide plate, as recited in the claimed invention. Further, as shown in Fig. 7 in Beeson, the alleged prism shaped

RECEIVED
DEC 23 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800